IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.15616 OF 2006

DATED 09-08-2006

BETWEEN
K.Usha Rani

.. PETITIONER

And

The Station House Officer,
Saroornagar Police Station,
Hyderabad and 4 others.

…RESPONDETNS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMA REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.15616 OF 2006

Oral Order: (per Sri DSRV.J)

This writ petition is taken up on the basis of a telegram issued by one K.Usha Rani D/o Satyanarayana, studying 4th class, C/o Alfa Model School, Karmanghat, Rangareddy District at Hyderabad stating that her father was taken away by K.Yadayachari, Bhagyamma and Narasimhachary while she and her father were going to hospital. She also averred in the telegram that her father was beaten by them and

was tried to be killed by causing head injury and in spite of registering a case in Crime No.695 of 2006 under Section 364 IPC on 17.6.2006 and Crime No.624 of 2006 under Section 324 IPC on 18.6.2006, no action was initiated by the police of Saroornagar and L.B.Nagar Police Stations.

A counter affidavit has been filed by the Inspector of Police, Saroornagar Police Station, Hyderabad stating that one Mr.Ravi who is the maternal uncle of the petitioner has lodged a complaint with the police on 17.7.2006 and the same was registered as Crime No.695 of 2006 under Section 364 IPC and on the next day i.e. on 18.7.2006, Satyanarayana, the father of the petitioner who was alleged to have been taken away by the above said persons came to L.B.Nagar Police Station and lodged a complaint. Both the complaints were clubbed together and investigation is in progress. It is further averred in the counter that the father of the petitioner (Satyanarayana) is in the habit of making complaints against several people for extracting money by posing himself as a police informer and that he was also habituated to give false complaints even against the police officers. All these contentions may not be relevant for this Court to be considered at this point of time inasmuch as it is stated by the Inspector of Police in the counter that investigation into the complaints made by the petitioner and her father is in progress.

In view of the above, appropriate steps be taken after the investigation into the complaints is completed and the result of the investigation must be intimated to the Magistrate by way of report under Section 173 Cr.P.C.

With the above direction, the writ petition is closed.

D.S.R.VARMA,J

Dated 9.8.2006

P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

msv